

Food Safety, Preparation, and Preservation

Food Safety, Preparation, and Preservation

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

1. Name of the Planned Program

Food Safety, Preparation, and Preservation

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
501	New and Improved Food Processing Technologies	10%	10%		
503	Quality Maintenance in Storing and Marketing Food Pr	10%	10%		
504	Home and Commercial Food Service	10%	10%		
711	Ensure Food Products Free of Harmful Chemicals, Inc	35%	35%		
712	Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Micro	35%	35%		
Total		100%	100%		

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actual	11.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c 217919	1890 Extension 0	Hatch 0	Evans-Allen 0
1862 Matching 268224	1890 Matching 0	1862 Matching 0	1890 Matching 0
1862 All Other 853319	1890 All Other 0	1862 All Other 0	1890 All Other 0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)**1. Brief description of the Activity**

The primary activities in this area are 3 statewide Extension Team Projects.

However we will only be reporting the below listed ETP this year:.

ETP17A - Food Safety Training for Food Service Workers

A total of 57 Intensive Food Safety Certification classes have been taught to a total of 692 individuals. This training course has a very tough evaluation at the end of the course and once the individual has passed the test they become certified for 5 years. Five HACCP classes were taught to Child Nutrition Workers for a total of 148 individuals trained. Nine Serving It Safe classes that train nearly 200 individuals were also offered to food service workers. This course is offered to line workers to advance their food safety education when the ServSafe certification is not required of all employees.

2. Brief description of the target audience

The primary target audience is Food Service workers through out the state of Alabama. This includes food service workers in restaurants, school lunch programs and day care facilities.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)**1. Standard output measures**

Target for the number of persons (contacts) reached through direct and indirect contact methods

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
Plan	34000	142000	21000	87000
2007	3074	622106	0	120542

2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)

Patent Applications Submitted

Year Target

Plan: 0

2007: 0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

	Extension	Research	Total
Plan			
2007	3	0	0

V(F). State Defined Outputs**Output Target****Output #1****Output Measure**

- ? This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which are described/explained in the prior "outcome activities and methods sections." The success of many of these outcomes will be formally evaluated/measured by using individual activity evaluation forms designed specifically for each activity, the success of other activities and methods will be measured by the level of participation in the activity. In the target boxes below for each year, we are indicating the number of individual activities within the ETPs for this program area that will be formally evaluated using an evaluation instrument designed specifically for that activity.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	3	3

Output #2**Output Measure**

- ? Workshops: 57 ServSafe certification classes, 9 Serving it Safe classes, 3 Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point workshops were taught.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	1040

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

O No.	Outcome Name
1	A major outcome will be the number of food service workers who participate in Extension sponsored Food Safety Training.
2	Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements: Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed What: Specifically what was done and how it was done. When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began. Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved. Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served. So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program. Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

Outcome #1

1. Outcome

A major outcome will be the number of food service workers who participate in Extension sponsored Food Safety Training.

2. Associated Institution Types

•1862 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	200	692

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

Food Service facilities serve safer food and consumers that frequent the facility consume safer food

What has been done

Employees have been trained on the correct procedures to serve food safely.

Results

Food Service workers were trained in an intensive Food Safety Certification course. Of the 692 taking the course, 568 passed the test used as the evaluation instrument. Only 124 did not pass the exam but gain in food service safety was gained by the participants. Less intense workshops were offered to over 200 food service workers with a gain in food safety knowledge. Hazard Analysis Critical Control workshops were also offered with a gain in knowledge and behavior. Some, one on one trainings, were offered to assist the food service facilities on writing their individualized HACCP plans.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
504	Home and Commercial Food Service

Outcome #2

1. Outcome

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements: Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed What: Specifically what was done and how it was done. When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began. Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved. Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served. So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program. Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

2. Associated Institution Types

•1862 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	9	692

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

Food Service facilities serve safer food and consumers that frequent the facility receive safer food.

What has been done

Workshops were taught and safer food is being served.

Results

Of the 692 individuals trained 568 passed the test, therefore completing the evaluation instrument. Knowledge gain was measured on different food service topics.

Only 124 did not pass the exam but gain in food service safety was gained by the participants.

Less intense workshops were offered to over 200 food service workers with a gain in food safety knowledge.

Hazard Analysis Critical Control workshops were also offered with a gain in knowledge and behavior. One-on-one trainings were offered to assist the food service facilities on writing their individualized HACCP plans.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
504	Home and Commercial Food Service

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

- ? Government Regulations

Brief Explanation

We trained less individuals than we had planned because we changed to an intensive Food Service Training program which took more time to teach and therefore the intensity resulted in us training less individuals. The outcome from an intense Food Safety exam gave us excellent evaluation for the program.

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)

1. Evaluation Studies Planned

- ? Before-After (before and after program)
- ? During (during program)
- ? Comparisons between program participants (individuals, group, organizations) and non-participants
- ? Comparison between locales where the program operates and sites without program intervention

Evaluation Results

Of the 692 taking the intensive food safety training course, 568 passed the test used as the evaluation instrument.

Only 124 did not pass the exam but gain in food service safety was gained by the participants.

Less intense workshops were offered to over 200 food service workers with a gain in food safety knowledge.

Hazard Analysis Critical Control workshops were also offered with a gain in knowledge and behavior. One-on-one trainings were offered to assist the food service facilities on writing their individualized HACCP plans.

Key Items of Evaluation

Food Safety Certification was taught with an intense evaluation instrument.

HACCP workshops were given with the result being a HACCP plan written by each Food Service Facility and the output was that knowledge was evaluated about the importance and use of a HACCP plan.